



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

but nowhere in the course of the book does the reader feel that Dr. Jackson comes to real grips with the author of *Von Reimarus to Wrede*. If, as Dr. Jackson admits, the eschatological element in the life of Jesus is to be emphasized, what is the answer to Schweitzer's theory that the eschatological dogma dominated and determined every act of Jesus' ministry? By what defence would Dr. Jackson maintain his development theory, based apparently on Mark, in the face of Schweitzer's furious bayonet charge against all "psychologizing"? Is Schweitzer right in maintaining that Jesus endeavored to conceal his Messiahship to the end, and that he died because it was this secret which Judas betrayed? Was the ethic of Jesus as entirely "world-renouncing" as Schweitzer maintains? These and similar questions are in our minds because Schweitzer has forced them upon us. But Dr. Jackson goes his own scholarly way, arguing freely on almost every page with Burkitt, J. Weiss, Bousset, and a host of others, and leaves us to infer as best we may, with the help of not more than two or three inadequate foot-notes, what he thinks of Schweitzer and his theories.

Dr. Jackson's final word is an interesting one. He describes eschatology as the "husk." To find the "kernel" he does not fall back on the idea that Jesus was primarily the founder of an ethical Kingdom; he is content with the eschatological Jesus. In his own words: "Is it not true to say that the idea embodied in the eschatology of Jesus—the embodiment belonging to its own day—is that of the ultimate triumph of the cause of God? The idea is so grand that it cannot be other than divine. Because divine, therefore of abiding significance" (p. 350). It is a reassuring word, but not a final one. Much remains to be said about the eschatology of Jesus that Dr. Jackson has not said in this book.

WARNER F. GOOKIN.

EPISCOPAL THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL, CAMBRIDGE.

THE MIRACLES OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. The Moorhouse Lectures for 1914. A. C. HEADLAM, D.D. John Murray. 1914. Pp. xvi, 361. 6s.

Dr. Headlam has written an exceedingly clever book in defence of miracles, the chief distinction of which lies in its method of presenting the evidence. Accepting the two-source theory, the author examines separately the evidence of Mark and Q, then of Matthew and Luke in their present form, and finally of other portions of the New Testament. Since the sources preceded the Gospels as we have them, and since, as the author holds, Luke was written

by a travelling-companion of Paul, the evidence is carried back to a comparatively early date, and the traditional connection of Mark and Q with Peter and Matthew respectively warrants a plea for its first-hand character. Accordingly, the evidence is pronounced good: "That is to say, if the events recorded were not such as to cause us difficulties in accepting them, we should give them credence as we should other events recorded in history" (p. 300). Dr. Headlam has so keen a mind that, were he not a theologian, we should suspect him of having written that sentence with his tongue in his cheek. For certainly he cannot seriously mean that the character of events reported has nothing to do with their credibility. To put it concretely: if a witness relates that he saw a painter fall from a swinging platform when the rope broke, and we believe him, should we give equal credence if the same observer testified that he saw the painter rise to his staging without rope or ladder or any such help but solely by spiritual levitation, before he began work in the morning?

Furthermore, Dr. Headlam makes much of current criticisms upon uniformity and laws of nature, and particularly of Huxley's well-known statement, arguing that belief in uniformity is not of scientific origin at all but was born of an *a priori* thought of God. But he fails to discriminate between event as such, and the interpretation of event as miracle. A scientific man may, indeed, be reluctant to declare *a priori* that this or that particular event cannot have occurred substantially as related, but the interpretation of it as miracle is quite a different matter. He would undoubtedly argue that the occurrence, although appearing miraculous, was in reality no miracle at all, but was due to the presence of circumstances and the operation of forces not yet thoroughly comprehended; and this Dr. Headlam would seem to accept, holding that scientific progress has made miracles more credible by revealing hitherto undreamed-of possibilities of nature. That is to say, *x-ray* photography creates a presupposition in favor of the turning of water into wine, or the feeding of five thousand men besides women and children with five loaves and two fishes which multiplied in distribution. That indeed may be true in the case of an uneducated man, but is it really true of Dr. Headlam? Concerning the various attempts to explain the latter miracle, Dr. Headlam says that "again and again a strain is put upon our powers of belief by the attempt to explain away a straightforward and natural story" (p. 326)—and, of course, none by its acceptance. It is remarkable that this particular miracle for which there is the best evidence, so far as testimony goes, should be the very one which intrinsically is least credible.

Miracles are finally defined as follows: "A miracle means really the supremacy of the spiritual forces of the world to an extraordinarily marked degree over the mere material" (p. 335). But such a definition is open to many objections. Man has supremacy over the material forces of the world, but it has been won through knowledge of their laws and confidence in their uniformity. To plead that nature and its laws are but the expression of God's will, and that therefore whatever happens because of his will as direct and active cause must be congruous with nature and in accordance with its laws, suggests again the tongue in the cheek. Is it true that power over "demons" once, and similar power over the deranged now, should be deemed spiritual power, especially in view of Mt. 7 23 and 12 27?

One lays down a book like this in a mood of hopelessness, for it makes glaringly evident the difference between the clerical and the scientific habit of mind. Dr. Headlam solemnly takes his opponents to task for their mental bias against miracles without recognizing that he is correspondingly prepossessed in their favor by his belief in revelation and the Incarnation. In fact, freedom from mental bias is quite out of the question for anybody above the level of a blockhead. The only question is whether the bias inclines towards or away from the rights of the case, or, to be specific, whether the scientific, critical attitude towards marvellous events reported to have occurred in the world of space and time is more appropriate than the clerical and ecclesiastical. What, for instance, would a scientific student think of this sentence which closes the chapter on the Virgin Birth? "From the naturalistic point of view it is really one of the least difficult of miracles; from the Christian point of view it is one of the most beautiful. It has been one of the greatest inspirations of Christian art, one of the purest influences on Christian life. The Church has *therefore* wisely retained it in its creed" (p. 299). The italics are mine.

W. W. FENN.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

LIGHT FROM THE EAST; STUDIES IN JAPANESE CONFUCIANISM. ROBERT CORNELL ARMSTRONG, Ph.D. (University of Toronto Studies in Philosophy). Published by the Librarian. 1914. Pp. xvi, 326. \$1.50.

This book deals with a subject which deserves the attention of the world's thinkers and scholars, but which has hitherto been almost entirely neglected. This fact alone furnishes a strong reason for gratitude to the present book. The author tells us that the motive